

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for examining the Application, and for indicating that claims 10, 14, 26, 30, 35, and 36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-28, 30, and 33-36 to further clarify the invention, as is explained in greater detail below. Support for the amendment of claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-28, 30, and 33-36 may be found throughout the specification, at least at page 4 lines 29-30, page 15 lines 19-25, and page 29 lines 16-21, and thus the amendment of claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-21, 24-28, 30, and 33-36 does not constitute the addition of new matter. With the amendments, claims 1-36 are pending.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-13, 15-25, 27-29, and 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,606,663 to Liao et al.

Applicant's amended independent claim 1 requires, among other things, inserting the authentication response into the single data communications session between the client device and the server device, and maintaining the single data communications session between the server device and the client device in the presence of authentication response information inserted into the data communications session between the client device and the server device. Applicant has amended claim 1 to make clear that the data communications session is a single data communications session. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least at, for example, page 4 lines 29-30, page 15 lines 19-25, and page 29 lines 16-21.

The Examiner cites to col. 1 line 13 to col. 2 line 64 and col. 6 line 61 to col. 8 line 23, as well as the Abstract and Figs. 1-3 of Liao et al. as disclosing these limitations. The cited text discloses a proxy server located between a client device and a server containing protected data; see Fig. 3 and col. 9 lines 11-13. The proxy server contains the authentication information required by the server for access to the protected data; see col. 9 lines 43-46. The proxy server intercepts a request from the client device for access to the protected data that does not include authentication

information; see col. 9 lines 35-40. The proxy server inserts the necessary authentication information into the request, translates the request, and sends the request to the server; see col 9 lines 35-46. Upon receipt of the request containing the proper authentication information, the server returns the requested protected data to the proxy server; see col. 11 lines 47-51 and 58-60. The proxy server translates the protected data and sends it to the client device; see col. 11 lines 58-60.

However, when a proxy server sits between a client and a server in the manner of the system disclosed in Liao et al., there is no single data communications session between the client and the server for an authentication response to be inserted into, or to be maintained in the presence of such an inserted authentication response, as required by Applicant's amended independent claim 1. Rather, there are two communications sessions present – one between the client and the proxy server, and another between the proxy server and the server containing the protected content, as may be seen graphically in Fig. 3. In detail, the proxy server of Liao et al. receives, from a client device, via a first data communications session (a UDP (User Datagram Protocol) session over which either WSP or HDTDP messages are exchanged) with that client device, a request for protected data located on a server; see col. 5 lines 5-26 and col. 9 lines 16-43. The proxy server first inserts an authentication response into the request and then translates that request; see col. 9 lines 35-46. The proxy server then communicates with the appropriate server via a separate data communications session (a TCP (Transmission Control Protocol) session over which HTTP messages are exchanged), see col. 4 line 64 to col. 5 line 4 and Fig. 3. During that separate, second data communications session, the proxy server forwards the translated request containing the authentication response; see col 9 lines 35-46. Thus, Liao et al. does not disclose inserting the authentication response into the single data communications session between the client device and the server device, as required by Applicant's independent claim 1, nor does Liao et al. disclose maintaining the single data communications session between the server device and the client device in the presence of authentication response information inserted into the single data communications session between the client device and the server device. Thus, Liao et

al. does not disclose Applicant's independent claim 1, and Applicant's independent claim 1 is allowable over Liao et al.

Applicant's amended independent claims 17, 33, and 34 all contain the same limitations as described above with respect to Applicant's allowable amended independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant's amended independent claims 17, 33, and 34 are each allowable over Liao et al.

Applicant's amended dependent claims 2-5, 8-14, 18-21, 24-28, 30, and 35-36, as well as Applicant's dependent claims 6-7, 15-16, 22-23, 29, and 31-32 depend from Applicant's allowable amended independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Applicant's amended dependent claims 2-5, 8-14, 18-21, 24-28, 30, and 35-36, as well as Applicant's dependent claims 6-7, 15-16, 22-23, 29, and 31-32 are themselves all allowable over Liao et al.

The Examiner indicated that claims 10, 14, 26, 30, 35, and 36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, as Applicant has overcome the current rejection based on Liao et al., Applicant declines to rewrite claims 10, 14, 26, 30, 35, and 36 in independent form at this time, though reserves the right to do so later.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests allowance of the application.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Page 20 of 20

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the Applicant's undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Shaun P. Montana, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No.: 54,320  
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-9660  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-35(4747)

Dated: August 9, 2006